



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Boden gewachsen sind, in einer Kirche, in der sich damals eine eigenartige religiöse Sprache und Anschauungswelt unbeschadet sonstiger Freiheiten durchgesetzt hatte." Surely the likelihood of the "church" reaching an interpretation and view so distinct from the synoptical view at a date anywhere near the year 100 is exceedingly slight. Far more likely is it that the Johannine literature was the output of a school. And that position once taken, Jülicher's assessment of the fourth gospel as a free literary creation (p. 335) must undergo a discount.

It is a pity that so good a book should be disfigured by an occasional touch of German academic manners. Thus Blass is satirically referred to as "der Philologe." It would seem that biblical scholars may take lessons in manners from amateur athletes.

HENRY S. NASH.

CAMBRIDGE DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Cambridge, Mass.

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT. Edited by W. ROBERTSON NICOLL. Complete in 5 vols. Vol. II. London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. Pp. 953. \$7.50.¹

THIS volume embraces the Acts, expounded by Professor R. J. Knowling, of King's College, London; the epistle to the Romans, by Professor James Denney, of the Free Church College, Glasgow; and the first epistle to the Corinthians, by Professor G. G. Findlay, of Headingley College.

It is somewhat unequally divided, the commentary on Acts filling 554 pages, that on Romans 171, and that on 1 Corinthians 228. The method is not the same throughout the volume, and some of the points of difference are worthy of notice. Thus in the commentary on Acts there are no general statements regarding the course of events, no divisions or headings; in that on Romans, while there are here and there brief analyses of the course of thought, there is no connected presentation of the content of the epistle; but in the commentary on 1 Corinthians there are quite full statements both of the thought of the several main sections and also of the subordinate divisions.

Again, in the commentary on Acts the simple Greek text is given; in that on Romans there is a considerable number of marginal references; and in that on Corinthians these references, most varied in

¹A review of Vol. I, by PROFESSOR W. ARNOLD STEVENS, is printed in this JOURNAL, Vol. II, pp. 884-9, October, 1898.

character, are several times as numerous as in the text of Romans. One other point may be mentioned here, viz., the method of referring to the apostles. The first expositor always prefixes the word "Saint" to the apostles' names; the second omits it as a rule; and the third not only omits it, but in numerous references to Paul is satisfied with the first letter of his name. Thus two writers out of the three agree in dropping the mediaeval prefix. It is to be hoped that at least as large a proportion of their readers will follow their example.

From the method of the writers we turn to their critical views. Dr. Knowling, in contending for the Lucan authorship of Acts, lays more stress than has been usual on the use of medical terms. He regards Acts as faithfully historical, and inclines to think that when Luke wrote it he contemplated a *τρίτος λόγος*. He leaves undecided the questions of time and place of composition, and finds no precise chronology in Acts. The Western Text is constantly taken into account, and Dr. Knowling, while not fully accepting the hypothesis of Blass, ascribes very considerable importance to his readings.

In his treatment of apparent discrepancies between Acts and other New Testament books, also in his exposition of passages which contain miraculous events, or which refer to the divinity of Christ, the positions of the author are not always defensible. Thus, e. g., he virtually adopts the old attempt to harmonize Matthew and Acts in regard to the ownership of the potter's field. It is quite possible, he says, that Judas should be spoken of as the possessor of the field, "just as Joseph of Arimathea is said to have hewn his own tomb, or Pilate to have scourged Jesus." These parallels, however, do not appear to be pertinent. For while Joseph and Pilate exercised direct authority regarding the specified acts, Judas was already dead when the field was purchased, and the author gives no confirmation of his assertion that the blood-money was still, "by a fiction of the law," the property of Judas. He had returned it to the chief priests and elders, had confessed that it was the price of sin, and had then shown the depth of his remorse by committing suicide. What ground is there for saying that the money was still his, and that what the priests bought with it could be held to be his property?

As illustrations of the author's treatment of passages in which there is an alleged miraculous element, these instances may be cited. He thinks that Luke regarded the speaking at Pentecost as miraculous, and he accepts it as such, but without attempting to remove the serious objections to this view. He holds that Philip was miraculously caught

away from the eunuch by the spirit of God, and that the cloths which had touched Paul's body actually wrought miraculous cures in Ephesus.

A word regarding some of the references to Christ. The fact that he is called ὁ Κύριος seems to be taken (p. 67) as implying divinity. This, however, is without warrant, as the word is simply one of relation. Again, when the author says, "it is equally certain that prayer was directed to Christ in the earliest days of the church," that is, as certain as that it was addressed to Jehovah, he makes a statement not justified by the three Thessalonian verses to which he refers.

The task of writing a commentary on Romans, always sufficiently formidable, has become even more so since the work of Sanday and Headlam. Dr. Denney's work will be compared with that, and the comparison, at least as far as form is concerned, will probably be unfavorable to the later book. It must, however, be said, in the first place, that the author, though a professor of systematic theology, has not treated Romans as a dogmatist, but has conceived of his task as historical. Some of his expositions are the more significant in view of his particular department of work. He holds, for instance, that it is a mistake to find the doctrine of two natures in the one person of the Lord in Rom. 1:3, 4, as theologians have usually done. Again, in discussing Rom. 5:12 he says that "nothing has been more pernicious in theology than the determination to define sin in such a way that in all its damning import the definition should be applicable to infants; it is to this we owe the moral atrocities that have disfigured most creeds." Once more the author's freedom from dogmatic prejudice and his sense of the historical are illustrated in his treatment of Rom. 9:5. He holds that the impression made by the study of Paul's writings makes it impossible to suppose that, in this passage, he called Christ "God blessed for ever."

Of Professor Findlay's *method* as compared with that of the other contributors we have already spoken. He characterizes 1 Corinthians as "the epistle of the cross in its social application," and gives an admirable analysis of its teaching on the nature of the Christian community and on the relations of the Christian to the world.

There are some instances in his exposition where it seems as though a more comprehensive study of Paul and of the Jewish theology would have led to different conclusions. Thus, *e. g.*, the rock which followed Israel was not symbolic of Christ, but "identical with him," and strangely enough the author holds that Jesus virtually made this identification in the words of John 7:37.

In the discussion of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor., chap. 10) we read that "through the cup . . . believers participate in the sacrifice of his [Christ's] blood offered to God." This conception is supported by reference to Rom. 3:25 and Eph. 1:7, neither of which passages, as it seems to us, has any necessary reference to the Lord's Supper. Moreover, this explanation of the cup ignores the one great positive thought in the words of Jesus regarding the significance of the supper, viz., that the blood *seals* the new covenant. If this interpretation appears to be unduly influenced by the theology of the church, so is that of the incarnation when the author says that Christ *wore* the *σῶμα σαρκός*. No one whose views of Jesus were determined by study of the New Testament alone would ever conceive of him as a pre-existent being who for a little time "wore the *σῶμα σαρκός*." But Professor Findlay's work, apart from the interpretation of some theological passages, compares favorably with any of the recent commentaries on 1 Corinthians.

GEORGE H. GILBERT.

DORSET, VT.

VINCULA SANCTORUM. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung der Gefangenschaftsbriebe des Apostels Paulus. Von H. Lisco. Berlin: Schneider, 1900. Pp. 159. M. 3.

It will be sufficient to state Dr. Lisco's positions. The apostle Paul, in the late summer of the same year in which he wrote the letters to the Corinthians, was, with several of his companions, imprisoned at Ephesus, in or in the neighborhood of a tower which still bears the name of "St. Paul's Prison." During this imprisonment he composed the Philippian, Colossian, and Ephesian epistles, and the letter to Philemon.

The apostle, after having been thrown into the arena, and miraculously rescued from the wild beasts, was released by the proconsul of Asia; an act against which the Ephesian populace, incited by Demetrius, protested in vain. It is assumed that Rom., chap. 16, was addressed to the church at Ephesus, and that Andronicus and Junia or Junias, who are designated as "my fellow-prisoners," were the companions of his imprisonment at Ephesus.

It may be observed in passing that the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment of Paul is not novel. It is regarded as probable by Weizsäcker. Peter Lombard, Lanfranc, and Erasmus held that the Colossian epistle was written from Ephesus, and Nicephorus Callisti